



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF PARIS.*

BEFORE the discussion "On the Origin of Indo-Europeans" commenced, M. d'Omalus d'Halloy offered some observations on the reasons which induced him to adopt opinions opposed to those generally received. He professed to belong to that school which ascribed the greatest influence to the action of external agents on all living beings; he believed that these had given rise to all the changes made known to us by the study of palæontology. On the other hand, he thought that, since the last geological revolution, the influence of the external agents is not sufficiently potent to produce the differences now observed in the various races of mankind; in other words, these differences are the results of an order of things different from that now existing.

As regards the questions of the monogenism or polygenism of the genus *Homo*, he considered them, in the present state of our knowledge, altogether beyond the reach of natural science.

M. Chavée: Our honourable colleague wishes to exclude the consideration of monogenism and polygenism; but it is just upon this point that I contest M. d'Omalus' opinion. In declaring that the question of the original unity or plurality of the human race is beyond the reach of natural science, he forgets what linguistics have accomplished in the domain of anthropology, and that philology is a natural science. What has philology done? It has studied the phenomenon of language like any other physiological act, and perhaps by a more rigorous method than is applied to other branches of natural history. It has proved that the languages now spoken present vestiges of phonetic changes which constitute veritable diseases; and, in tracing them back, we have become acquainted with the pathological laws, and the primitive, normal, and perfect form, of which our languages are only the altered products. This primitive form, as regards the peoples of our race, is the Aryan, from which the Sanscrit, the Zend, the Greek, the Latin, the Lithuanian, and the Gothic are only the derived forms. Setting aside the Aryan, Semitic, and Tatar languages, I do not think that philology is sufficiently advanced to affirm anything; but within the limits of these languages we are, thanks to labours of Grimm, Bopp, Benfey, Pott, and other living linguists, enabled to demonstrate, not merely that the assimilation of the Aryan

* [Continued from p. 21, No. VIII.] Séance du 18 Février, 1864. Discussion sur des origines Indo-Européens.

to the Semitic language is impossible, but, as different effects cannot be produced but by different causes, it cannot be that the Semitic forms are the work of a race resembling the Aryan race." After showing by some illustrative examples that the Semitic and Aryan languages are radically distinct, he concludes in the following terms: "Every language is the spontaneous product of the cerebral organism; and whenever I see two radically distinct languages, distinct in their phonetic elements, *i. e.* in their anatomy, distinct in their grammatical construction, *i. e.* in their physiology, I am authorised to infer that the organisms which have produced these languages are also radically distinct. For these reasons, I am opposed to the opinion of our learned colleague M. d'Omalius, who sustains that questions of origin are, in the present state of our knowledge, beyond our reach. These questions have, on the contrary, in my opinion, long been solved by philology."

M. d'Omalius, in reply, said that he used the terms polygenism and monogenism for the express purpose of eliminating them from the present discussion, being of opinion that they had no direct relation to the questions proposed. It did not follow that, because the same language is spoken in different parts of the globe, the peoples employing it are of the same origin. In Bactria were found the remnants of a lost language, which, though reposing upon the same basis as our own languages, is said to be greatly developed and more perfect. Is there more reason to suppose that the European languages are derived from this Aryan source, than to maintain just the contrary, namely, that this Aryan language represents a degree of development of languages imported from Europe? This is the whole question which philology has to solve; it is upon this point that he asked for facts.

M. Broca said, that he had listened with great interest to M. Chavée's exposition of principles which he had himself long adopted, though on different grounds. Still, he shared the opinion of M. d'Omalius, that polygenism and monogenism should be excluded, in order to circumscribe the debate; he would even still more restrict the discussion, by distinguishing in the propositions of M. d'Omalius two very distinct questions: (1) Whence came the races now peopling Europe? and (2) Whence came the languages now spoken in Europe? These two questions should, in his opinion, be examined separately; not merely because those who have studied the first question may not have studied the second, but because they will probably not yield identical solutions, or may even become contradictory. Whence, in fact, came the races now peopling Europe? from Europe. Whence came the languages spoken in Europe? from Asia. He could not, therefore, assent to

a doctrine which, starting from a complete assimilation of languages and races, lays down as a principle that the conformity of a language indicates the unity of stock. . . . It is for philologists to demonstrate in what manner the Asiatic languages propagated in Europe. Excepting the Fins, the Magyars, the Turks, the Basques, and the Laps, all the peoples in Europe speak languages belonging to the same family. There were thus hundreds of millions of men using the same idiom, presenting at the same time considerable anatomical differences. In the South we find the Greeks, the Italians, the Spaniards; in the North, the Scandinavians, Germans, Slavonians, Anglo-Saxons. Among these races we find tall, short, and middle-sized tribes; here with flaxen, there with brown hair. There is great variation in the colour of the iris and of the skin; and these races form innumerable combinations. The craniological characters and the facial proportions also permit the formation of groups sufficiently distinct, not certainly to form *types*, but sufficient to form different *races*. Whence came these distinctive characters? If it be assumed that one people only colonised Europe, we ought to find a certain relation between the media and the differential modifications. But this relation does not exist. In Ireland we see individuals with brown skin, brown hair, brown eyes, short stature, seemingly belonging to the primitive race of Europe, living side by side with individuals with light hair, fair complexion, and of tall stature. In Greece we find the analogues. These facts are so evident and incontestable, that we are authorised to repudiate, as contrary to the anthropological geography of Europe, any interpretation tending to establish the ethnic unity of that part of the world. The peoples which came from Asia belonged to a dolichocephalic race; but on their arrival in Europe they found at least two races, one brachycephalic, and the other dolichocephalic, which is demonstrated by human remains found in the most ancient graves. Who can say that in those remote times the differences now obtaining between contemporaneous races did not exist? M. Broca concluded thus: "For my part, I am of opinion that the Asiatic invaders found themselves face to face with a human Fauna which, though not in its details, yet in its *ensemble*, did not essentially differ from its actual condition. On the whole, I so far agree with my venerable colleague M. d'Omalus, that the inhabitants of Europe are pretty nearly the same now as they were at the period of the Asiatic emigration; but, as regards the Indo-European languages, I believe that there exist good reasons for assuming that they have travelled from the East to the West."

M. Bonté said that he did not deny that the Greek, German, Celtic, and Slavonian languages were derived from the Aryan, that fact being

proved; but he must protest against the principle of basing anthropology solely upon linguistics, and to consider, as M. Chavée has done, language as the most reliable criterion for ascertaining the race. This assertion formed no part of the questions put by M. d'Omalius, who simply asked whether the peoples called Indo-Europeans came from Asia, or whether they did not, on the contrary, proceed from Europe to Asia. He protested against the assertion of M. Chavée, and he assigned to languages a secondary rank. After citing a number of instances of peoples having changed their respective languages, M. Bonté said, all this proves that there exists no sufficient reason for giving to language the preference over physical characters. Is it, moreover, rational, when man is to be classified according to his physical character, to prefer the work of man to man himself? To put this question is at once to answer it.

M. Bertillon remarked, that M. Broca had advanced the theory that, before the Asiatic immigration, the European races differed very little from the living races: and that the unity of the European languages had been the result of this Aryan contact, which was, however, not sufficiently potent to alter the anatomical types. In order to appreciate the probability of such a doctrine, we must study the history of the Aryan migrations in India, where we find two types—the Brahmins, or the conquerors, and the Sudras, or the vanquished; though both races speak the same language, their types have remained distinct. In Europe, on the contrary (excluding the Semitics, who are but few in number), we are struck by the great unity, not only as regards language, but as regards all psychological characters influencing civilisation. Again, M. Broca tells us that the Asiatic invaders were dolichocephalic. Do not the majority of Europeans possess the same character? Now, to realise such a uniformity, the Aryan blood must have been largely infused into Europe. It must be admitted that the languages at present spoken have not all altered in the same degree; thus the Lithuanian is said to be nearly pure Sanscrit. It might be interesting to ascertain whether this phenomenon is not owing to a numerical superiority of the conquerors. The Western languages of Europe are, according to M. Chavée, singularly corrupt. M. Bertillon would, therefore, put the question to philologists, whether languages do not alter by the intermixture of vocables, in the same way as the physical forms alter by the intermixture of blood?

The President here interposed, and requested the speakers to confine their strictures to the questions proposed, touching the hypothesis of the Asiatic origin of the peoples of Europe, and the inflected languages.

M. Gerard de Rialle said that he would only touch upon the second

question, namely, whether the inflected languages had been imported from Asia into Europe, or whether Asia received them from Europe. It may, for the solution of this question, perhaps be sufficient to examine which of the languages derived from the Aryan are least modified; and these must be supposed to be nearest to the spot of origin. Such languages are the Zend and the Sanscrit, the roots of which have been reconstituted partly by the labours of M. Chavée. The old Persian and the old Hindoo are found in Asia; and this fact appeared to him to dispose of the question of origin. The deformation of languages seemed to him to indicate the distance of their origin. Thus the deformations of the Celtic, Germanic, and Slavonian languages, prove that they had for a long time lived amid physical media different from those in which they were originally developed.

M. d'Omalius d'Halloy: In the observations of M. Broca, I find but few, or rather no answers to my theory. He recognises that peoples existed in Europe before the arrival of invaders whom he terms Asiatics; these peoples, which had, in his opinion, black hair and black eyes, were vanquished by the peoples with blue eyes and light hair, who came from Asia. Now, this is precisely my question: What is the foundation for the prevalent opinion concerning the Asiatic origin of the latter? It is pretended that there are in Asia light-haired races; but when they are sought for, they cannot be found. Fair-complexioned peoples, small in number, are stated to exist in a small spot of the Himalaya, the Siaposh, for example, or the Ossetines in the Caucasus, who might well have descended from Europeans. The Chinese historians speak, it is true, of a people with green eyes and red hair; but these populations belong to a reddish type, and should not, in my opinion, be confounded with the light-haired type. On the other hand, we find, as far as history reaches, fair-complexioned peoples in the centre of Europe; and I am inclined to think that they were there from the remotest antiquity. These bellicose and conquering peoples of Germany, called the *officina gentium* by the ancients, have spread their conquests to considerable distances. No facts have been cited except the inferences from linguistic facts. Now, with all respect for that science, I cannot accord to it the privilege to dominate in anthropology above what I call the natural characters; the language of a people may change entirely, and examples of it are common enough. Let me only cite that of the French, who are neither Franks nor Romans, though some small portion of Roman blood may have been infused into the constitution of the French nation. It has also been asserted that, the languages of Bactria being purer than ours, they must be nearer the cradle of our race. I repeat that the fact of the superiority of the Aryan does not

appear to me to lead to that theory. A well developed language does not indicate the vicinity of the birthplace of a race ; it merely indicates the civilisation of the people speaking it. Now, on the hypothesis of the European origin of the Aryans, what is there astonishing in it that India, in the vicinity of Semitic civilisation, should have reached a high degree of perfection, whilst such peoples as remained in Europe conserved an inferior language ? Bearing in mind what the Latin historians said of the Germans at the time of Tacitus, how can it be sustained that they had *descended* from the Aryans of India, who possessed so perfect a language. I maintain, therefore, that the argument drawn from the perfection of the Aryan language, so far from supporting the hypothesis of the Asiatic origin of Europeans, is rather in favour of the opposite hypothesis.

M. Chavée replied that he never denied that a conqueror might impose a new language on a country. In citing Herodotus, St. Jerome, and Tacitus, the facts were, so to speak, of yesterday. The formation and organic development of languages belong to more remote periods. In the Rig-veda we possess a precious philological document belonging to a period at least 14,000 years before our era, setting aside the first code of Manou about 13,900 before our era. With history commences the corruption of languages, nay, they are then already corrupt ; they degenerate according to laws formulated by science, and these laws may be applied to the comparison of the sister languages. . . . His opinion, in short, was, that organisms in a morbid state are derived from healthy organisms ; but the reverse never occurs.

M. Rameau contended that the propositions of M. d'Omalius are not equally applicable to all Aryan peoples. What is the general opinion touching the races of Europe ? That there existed at a remote period a primary stock, composed of Basques, Fins, and Iberians ; then arrived the invaders—the Celts from the North, the Pelasgi from the South ; then came the Germans, the Scandinavians, the Getæ ; and finally, the Scythians. From this *ensemble* of ethnic elements should be eliminated such whose origin is incontestable, namely, the Basques, the Iberians, and the Scythians ; the question is then already simplified. We are in possession of historic documents as regards the Goths, the Alani, the Cimbri, and the Teutons, the first invasion of whom was repulsed by Darius. The Asiatic origin of the German stock is not much disputed ; what, then, remains to be discussed ? The Celts and the Pelasgi ; but, as the Asiatic origin of the Pelasgi is undoubted, there remained only the Celts, to the origin of which, in M. Rameau's opinion, the discussion should be confined.

M. Broca feared that he had badly expressed himself, as M. d'Omalus understood him to say that he considered the first Asiatic invaders to have been fair complexioned, and that the light haired Europeans were their descendants. He had stated, on the contrary, that before the first invasion the repartition in Europe of fair and brown individuals was in its *ensemble*, though not in detail, probably little different from what it is now.

The discussion was then adjourned.

FAREWELL DINNER TO CAPTAIN BURTON.

ON Tuesday, April 4th, 1865, there was celebrated an event in London of such importance to anthropological science as to deserve an especial record in these pages. On this day the Anthropological Society of London celebrated the election into their society of five hundred Fellows, by giving a public dinner to Captain Richard F. Burton, their senior vice-president. What took place on this occasion should be made known as widely as possible, as we think it cannot fail to have a beneficial influence on the progress of anthropological science in this country. The Right Honourable Lord Stanley, M.P., F.R.S., F.A.S.L., took the chair, and was supported on the right by Captain Burton, Arthur Russell, Esq., M.P., J. A. Hardcastle, Esq., M.P., General Sir Trevor Phillips, W. S. W. Vaux, Esq., R. Bagshawe, Esq.; and on his left by Lord Houghton, Dr. James Hunt (President of the Anthropological Society), Viscount Milton, Sir G. Synge, Bart., and Mr. George B. Mathew, H.M. Minister to Central America.

At the end of the four tables there presided Mr. J. Frederick Collingwood, V.P.A.S.L., Dr. Berthold Seemann, V.P.A.S.L., Dr. R. S. Charnock, Treasurer A.S.L., and Mr. George E. Roberts, Hon. Sec. A.S.L. Amongst the company we noticed present were the

Rev. Henry F. Rivers
 Rev. Harry Tudor
 Rev. Maurice P. Clifford, D.D.
 H. G. Atkinson, Esq., F.S.A., F.A.S.L.
 S. E. Collingwood, Esq., F.G.S., F.A.S.L.
 George North, Esq., F.A.S.L.
 L. O. Pike, Esq., M.A., F.A.S.L.
 J. Reddie, Esq., F.A.S.L.
 H. Brookes, Esq., F.A.S.L.
 E. Hart, Esq., F.R.C.S., F.A.S.L.
 E. Bellamy, Esq., F.A.S.L.

A. Swinburne, Esq., F.A.S.L.
 E. Tinsley, Esq., F.A.S.L.
 Captain J. Hastie, F.A.S.L.
 C. Brett, Esq., F.A.S.L.
 N. Trübner, Esq., F.A.S.L.
 W. Pinkerton, Esq., F.S.A., F.A.S.L.
 H. W. Jackson, Esq., F.A.S.L.
 R. B. N. Walker, Esq., F.A.S.L.
 H. Hotze, Esq., F.A.S.L.
 H. Hector, Esq., F.A.S.L.
 G. Dibley, Esq., F.A.S.L.